

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THE MEDIATING ROLE OF THREAT

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN PARTIAL FULLFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

FOR THE DEGREE

MASTER OF ARTS

BY

KELLY BARNES

BERNARD WHITLEY, JR., CHAIRPERSON

BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

MUNCIE, IN

MAY 2010

Acknowledgments

This thesis would not have been possible were it not for the generous support of a number of people:

I am grateful to my chairperson, Dr. Bernard Whitley. His ideas, suggestions, and careful reviews of each and every draft were invaluable during this process. I appreciate all of the time and support he put into this project.

I would like to thank Dr. Mary Kite not only for serving on this thesis committee, but also for all of the time she spent being a mentor to me during my time at Ball State.

I would also like to thank Dr. W. Holmes Finch for donating his time to serve on my committee as well as for the valuable statistical knowledge he has taught me.

Finally, I am so grateful for the love and support I have received from my family and friends. They were a constant source of encouragement and were always interested in the work I was doing.

I am indebted to each and every one of these individuals and this thesis would not have been possible without them.

Thank you,

Kelly Barnes

Abstract

Patriotism is an important value in American culture. Patriotism has obvious benefits such as increasing civic unity; however, researchers have acknowledged that it can take both positive and negative forms. Schatz (1994) developed the concepts of blind and constructive patriotism to characterize this difference. The current study, based on previous research linking blind patriotism and stereotyping to RWA and threat, predicted that blind patriotism would be related to increased stereotyping of African Americans, gay men, and lesbians while constructive patriotism would not. It was also predicted this relationship would be mediated by RWA, SDO, and threat. Results generally supported these predictions; blind patriotism was related to increased stereotyping and this relationship was largely mediated by RWA, SDO, and threat. Interestingly, constructive patriotism was also found to be related to increased stereotyping although this relationship was not mediated by RWA, SDO, and threat.

Blind Patriotism, Stereotyping, and the Mediating Role of Threat

Americans are well acquainted with the concept of patriotism. From the red, white, and blue flying prominently on buildings, cars, and politicians' lapels to the Star Spangled Banner opening a baseball game, there are reminders of patriotism everywhere. Americans are taught at a young age to be proud to be an American through the Pledge of Allegiance, history lessons, and countless patriotic songs. America's strong patriotism is especially evident during times of national crisis (e.g., the September 11th terrorist attacks) or during times of political change such as a Presidential election. With patriotism playing such an important role in American culture, it is helpful to understand what this phenomenon is and what effects it may have.

Patriotism is a seemingly positive force. It creates unity and loyalty among citizens and promotes pride and concern for one's nation. However, despite the obvious benefits of patriotism, it also entails many negative effects. One such effect is that promoting one's own nation may lead to hostility toward other groups or individuals who are not members of one's nation (Johnson, 1997). One need not think too hard to discover patriotism of this type. Nazi Germany during World War II and the Soviet Union during the Cold War are two examples of countries whose people were deeply patriotic and whose rulers used that patriotism to justify horrendous acts (Bar-Tal, 1997; Gozman, 1997). The United States is not immune to this type of negative patriotism either. A cursory glance through a history text reveals events such as Native Americans' being displaced during Manifest Destiny, anti-German and Japanese propaganda during the Second World War, and discrimination against Muslims after the September 11 attacks, all of which were probably due, in part, to the surges of patriotism at those times.

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

The purpose of the present study is to test the hypothesis that this negative form of patriotism is related to increased stereotyping of outgroups and that this relationship is mediated by chronic feelings of threat. This hypothesis is important because it may provide information about the personality variables and motives that underlie stereotyping as well as providing insight into the negative effects of patriotism.

Patriotism

Patriotism is “a binding affection between a person and his/her group and its land. It reflects a positive evaluation of and emotion toward the group and its territory, and is expressed in beliefs and feelings connoting love, pride, loyalty, devotion, commitment, and care” (Bar-Tal & Staub, 1997, p. 2). Patriotism has the benefits of increasing unity, civic involvement and a concern for the well-being of the nation and its citizens. Nevertheless, patriotism has consistently been identified as having both positive and negative forms (Bar-Tal & Staub, 1997; Johnson, 1997; Reykowski, 1997). Schatz (1994) developed the concepts of blind and constructive patriotism to represent this dichotomy.

Forms of patriotism. Constructive patriotism is the need to balance “attachment to and consideration for the well-being of one’s own group with an inclusive orientation to human beings, with respect for the rights and welfare of all people” (Staub, 1997, p. 214). In this type of patriotism, individuals would not maintain loyalty to their nation at the expense of other people. Constructive patriots strive to support their nation while still caring about the needs of citizens of other nations around the world. Another characteristic of constructive patriotism is the ability to constructively criticize aspects of one’s nation in the hope of bringing about change. Constructive patriots are loyal to and proud of their country but are also able to admit that it is not perfect and strive to remedy its imperfections (Schatz & Staub, 1997). Patriotism,

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

when manifested in this positive form, can be beneficial for improving one's nation and its relationship with other nations. Constructive patriotism can lead concerned citizens to work to improve the state of a nation and serve as a check to ensure that the government does not abuse its power. Schatz, Staub, and Lavine (1999) found that political efficacy and political information gathering were positive predictors of constructive patriotism. Thus, constructive patriots are people who are informed about the state of the nation and believe they have power to influence change.

In contrast, blind patriotism is "an intense alignment by people with their nation or group and uncritical acceptance and support for its policies and practices, with an absence of moral consideration of their consequences or disregard of their impact on the welfare of human beings who are outside the group or are members of its sub-groups" (Staub, 1997, p. 213). Like constructive patriots, blind patriots are loyal to and proud of their country as these elements are common to patriotism in general. Blind patriots are different, however, in that they do not see what their nation does in terms of right or wrong. The nation can do no wrong in their eyes, so they are not concerned with the way the nation may treat other nations or certain subgroups of its own citizens. Schatz et al. (1999) found blind patriotism to be correlated with measures of nationalism, national vulnerability, and fears of cultural contamination. Blind patriots have a desire to see their own nation dominate others, fear that the nation is constantly vulnerable to foreign attack, and believe there is a threat of other nations' contaminating the American way of life and watering down the homogeneity of American culture (Schatz & Staub, 1997).

Psychometrically, blind and constructive patriotism tend to be orthogonal constructs, indicating that they are distinctly different types of patriotism (Schatz, 1994; Spry & Hornsey,

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

2007). The negative form of patriotism, blind patriotism, is the primary focus of the current study.

Psychological functions of patriotism. Although often seen as only a social phenomenon, patriotism can also meet motivational needs at both the intergroup and individual level. At the intergroup level, patriotism may serve to meet people's social identity needs. Social identity theory holds that people categorize the world into groups to which they belong and groups to which they do not belong and that people favor members of their own groups (ingroups) over members of groups of which they were not a part (outgroups; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971). This favoritism occurs even if the groups are arbitrarily determined and when no previous hostility exists.

Social identity theory also proposes that people's social identities contribute to their overall personal identities which in turn leads to higher self-esteem (Aberson, Healy, & Romero, 2000). Therefore, showing ingroup favoritism serves to bolster one's social identity by instilling one's ingroup with positive characteristics and elevating it above outgroups (Worchel & Coutant, 1997). These positive characteristics associated with the ingroup then spill over into one's personal identity, thus increasing one's self-esteem. Social identity theory further holds that the more powerful one's ingroup is, the more identifying with that group will increase one's self-esteem. For most people, the largest, most influential group they can be a part of is the nation in which they live (Bar-Tal & Staub, 1997). Thus, national identity is particularly important to one's social identity. Because one's nation is so central to one's social identity, it also provides additional incentive to elevate that particular ingroup, often at the expense of outgroups. Patriotism is centered on the celebration of one's nation and could be seen as one of the most tangible examples of ingroup favoritism.

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

In addition to improving one's self-esteem, patriotism may serve other motivational purposes as well, such as a psychological defense against perceived threats. Blind patriotism is related to greater perception of threats of cultural contamination, foreign military aggression, and national vulnerability (Schatz & Staub, 1997; Schatz, et al., 1999; Spry & Hornsey, 2007). The current study proposes that blind patriotism is a response to chronic feelings of threat. This hypothesis is similar to Terror Management Theory (TMT; Solomon, Greenberg, & Pyszczynski, 2000) with the difference that blind patriotism is a response to chronic threat, whereas TMT deals with acute situational threats.

TMT proposes that because of humans' ability to think rationally there is a potential for the knowledge of one's own mortality to create debilitating terror. One's cultural worldview serves as a buffer against this fear of death so that one need not be paralyzed by this fear. Humans created cultural beliefs as methods of transcending death and created social institutions to pass on those beliefs. Specific beliefs deal with the origins of life, how one is to live, and what will happen after death. These beliefs allow people to think that they are a part of something larger than themselves and enable people to "live on" either through earthly contributions (such as works of art, knowledge, or perhaps through their children) or in an after-life as many religious beliefs assert. TMT has a robust literature supporting the idea that when one's mortality is made salient, the response is to strengthen one's worldview (Solomon, et al., 2000). That is, being put in a situation which causes one to reflect on one's own death, such as being near a funeral home or cemetery, creates a short-term, situational feeling of being threatened by death. In contrast, a chronic threat is persistent and may be related to personality factors which make some people more prone to chronic feelings of threat than others.

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

For this study, I propose that rather than responding only to acute situational threats, blind patriots also have a tendency to chronically see the world as more threatening than constructive patriots. This hypothesis is based on studies that have linked blind patriotism to threat (Schatz & Staub, 1997; Spry & Hornsey, 2007) and by blind patriotism's relationship to right-wing authoritarianism (Schatz, et al., 1999) and social dominance orientation (Pena & Sidanius, 2002). Authoritarianism and social dominance, in turn, are linked to individual differences in the acceptance of stereotypes (Whitley & Kite, 2010).

Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation

Right-wing authoritarianism (RWA; Altemeyer, 1981) is an individual-difference variable that can develop as a type of worldview defense because it embraces order, stability, and convention. RWA is made up of three attitude clusters: authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism. Authoritarian submission is an elevated level of submission to the legitimate authorities within one's society. Authoritarian aggression is aggression aimed at people whom the society deems worthy of aggression. Finally, conventionalism is a high degree of devotion to societal norms and customs. Blind patriotism and threat have both been connected to right-wing authoritarianism (Schatz, et al., 1999; Spry & Hornsey, 2007) and thus right wing authoritarianism provides the link between blind patriotism and threat.

Duckitt (2001) has proposed that although RWA is often characterized as a personality variable, it might be more accurate to describe it a measure of ideological attitudes. If RWA is actually an ideology, then, Duckitt proposed, perhaps there are other variables that underlie this set of attitudes. This analysis led Duckitt to his theory that RWA is based on a belief in the world as a dangerous place. People who feel that the world is a dangerous place are faced with feelings of threat and fear. People can assuage these feelings of fear and threat by embracing the

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

order, stability, and power of the society to which they belong; that is, by embracing the principles of RWA. Duckitt, Wagner, du Plessi, and Birum (2002) empirically confirmed the link between RWA and the belief in the world as a dangerous place. Believing that the world is a dangerous place is a form of the chronic feelings of threat discussed above, and the relation of RWA to blind patriotism forms the basis for the current study's hypothesis of a link between blind patriotism and chronic threat.

Duckitt's (2001) model dealt not only with RWA, but explained a related individual difference variable, social dominance orientation (SDO; Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). SDO is "the extent to which one desires that one's ingroup dominate and be superior to outgroups" (Pratto, et al., 1994, p. 742). The theory underlying SDO proposes that people who are characterized by high levels of the construct will prefer political systems that are hierarchically organized over more egalitarian systems (Pratto, et al., 1994). Duckitt proposed that, as with RWA, a certain type of worldview underlies SDO. In this case, he suggested that the foundation of SDO is a belief that the world as a competitive jungle. Believing that the world is a competitive jungle could also lead to feelings of fear and threat, although those feelings may take slightly different forms than believing in the world as a dangerous place. SDO holds that people deal with these fears by working to ensure that their social group is at the top of the social hierarchy and by behaving in ways that maintain that social order.

Jost and Thompson (2000) found two components within SDO, anti-egalitarianism, which emphasizes the desire for social hierarchy, and group dominance or the desire to see one's group dominate other groups. Peña and Sidanius (2002) found a link between patriotism and group dominance such that the higher their White (but not Latino) participants were on group dominance, the higher the levels of U.S. patriotism they demonstrated. They found no

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

relationship between patriotism and the anti-egalitarianism component of SDO for either Whites or Latinos. The results of this study are a good starting point for looking at SDO and patriotism; however no research to date has examined specifically SDO and blind and constructive patriotism.

It is possible that SDO could be another link between blind patriotism and threat in addition to RWA. Crowson (2009) found moderate correlations between SDO and both symbolic and realistic terrorist threats and Morrison, Fast, and Ybarra (2009) found that threat was a moderator in the relationship between group status and SDO. Although SDO has not yet been specifically connected to blind patriotism, it is not difficult to see how that link could exist. If Peña and Sidanius (2002) had broken patriotism into its blind and constructive components they may have found that the relation of higher patriotism to higher endorsement of group dominance was largely due to blind patriotism. This relationship may exist because blind patriotism is related to unconditional support for the nation and its policies. Therefore blind patriots would probably be more likely to endorse the social hierarchy of the nation.

Combining TMT's model of worldview defense as an anxiety buffer with blind patriotism as a chronic response to threat lays the foundation for the current study's prediction that people who consistently feel threatened will adopt blind patriotism as a way to defend their worldviews against threat. Furthermore, as outlined next, blind patriots will also be more likely to endorse stereotypes of outgroups.

Stereotypes

When thinking of a member of a particular group, we can often conjure up a tentative image of the person without ever having encountered that particular individual. We are able to do this, in part, because we use stereotypes. Stereotypes are "beliefs and opinions about the

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

characteristics, attributes, and behaviors of members of various groups” (Whitley & Kite, 2010, p. 9). We use these sets of characteristics to organize our world and allow us to make predictions in future interactions.

Stereotypes are based on both cognitive and motivational processes (Schaller & Maass, 1989). On the cognitive side, stereotypes are a natural extension of a normal cognitive process, categorization. The human mind organizes information by categorizing it into groups of items with similar features. Through the creation of these groups, we can quickly categorize a novel object which allows us to readily access previous relevant information about members of the category. Person perception works in much the same way by creating groups of individuals bound by common traits. Categorization aids interactions with others by allowing us to draw on category-relevant knowledge and tentatively predict others’ behavior.

In addition to its cognitive purposes, social categorization serves motivational purposes similar to those served by patriotism. Categorization supports social identity processes by enabling people to create ingroups and outgroups. Once these groups are created, as was mentioned earlier, one can bolster one’s self-esteem by identifying with a strong ingroup and showing ingroup favoritism.

Stereotyping is also similar to patriotism in that it is related to RWA (Strube & Rahimi, 2006; Whitley, 1999). As noted earlier, Duckitt (2001) has found that RWA and SDO stem from the belief that the world is a dangerous place and the belief that the world is a competitive jungle, respectively. Clinging to familiar stereotypes is a concrete way to enhance one’s worldview and deal with the fear brought about by those particular beliefs.

The Current Research

Previous research has established links between blind patriotism and threat, stereotyping and threat, and blind patriotism and stereotyping. My goal in the current study is to connect these three constructs into a comprehensive model. This model begins with chronic perceived threat which leads to blind patriotism as a response to that threat. Blind patriotism is related to SDO and RWA and all three lead to increased stereotyping. My hypothesis is that blind patriots will stereotype African-Americans, lesbians, and gay men more than constructive patriots and non-patriots and that this relationship will be mediated by chronic feelings of threat. This relationship should also exist independently of RWA and SDO if blind patriotism is a viable construct in its own right and its relationship to stereotyping is not due only to the correlation between blind patriotism and SDO and RWA.

Method

Participants

Participants were 539 introductory psychology students at a Midwestern public university who took part in the research in partial fulfillment of a course requirement. The population of interest for this research was White heterosexual men and women who are United States citizens. For this reason, participants who did not meet those criteria were excluded from the analyses. This procedure resulted in the exclusion of 70 non-White participants, 10 participants who were not U.S. citizens, and 61 participants who did not self-identify as completely heterosexual. An additional 60 participants were excluded, because they took an unusually long (more than one hour) or unusually short (less than ten minutes) time to complete the questionnaire, behaviors that suggest that they may not have taken the study seriously. After excluding these individuals, 338 participants remained (138 men and 200 women) who had a mean age of 19.25 years.

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

Measures

Participants completed a questionnaire consisting of the following measures. Unless otherwise noted, all measures used 5-point scales anchored at 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

Demographic Information. The demographic information collected was participant's age, gender, race, sexual orientation, and nationality. See Appendix A for the complete list of items.

Stereotypes. Stereotypes of African Americans were assessed with Czopp and Monteith's (2006) 30-item Complimentary Stereotypes and Negative Prejudice (CSNP) scale. This scale is comprised of two subscales. The first is complimentary (positive) stereotypes and consists of items related to African Americans' possessing characteristics that loaded onto one of three factors: athletic, rhythmic, or cool/sexual. The second subscale is negative stereotypes and is made up of characteristics that loaded onto one of three factors: inferiority, social policies, and contact. A complete list of items is in Appendix B. Czopp and Monteith (2006) demonstrated that this scale has good reliability (coefficient alpha = .88) and good convergent and discriminant validity. The present sample demonstrated adequate to good reliability for the CSNP as a whole (coefficient alpha = .79) and for each of the subscales, complimentary stereotypes (coefficient alpha = .68) and negative prejudices (coefficient alpha = .80).

Stereotypes of lesbians and gay men were assessed separately using the stereotype subscale of Lamar and Kite's (1998) Components of Attitudes Toward Homosexuality scale. This subscale has seven items (see Appendix C). Lamar and Kite found that this subscale had good internal consistency with coefficient alphas of .78 for gay male targets and .75 for lesbian

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

targets. The current sample also demonstrated good reliability for gay male targets (coefficient $\alpha = .78$) and lesbian targets (coefficient $\alpha = .80$).

Perceived threat. Perceptions of outgroup threat from African Americans, lesbians, and gay men were assessed using Duckitt's (2006) Intergroup Threat scale. This scale consists of 8 items assessing the level of perceived threat of a particular target outgroup; Appendix D has a complete list of items. Duckitt found that this scale had adequate to good internal consistency with coefficient alphas of between .67 to .90 depending on the target group being tested. The current sample demonstrated good internal consistencies for African American targets (coefficient $\alpha = .84$), gay male targets (coefficient $\alpha = .89$), and lesbian targets (coefficient $\alpha = .87$).

Social dominance orientation (SDO). SDO was assessed using Jost and Thompson's (2000) revision of Pratto et al.'s (1994) SDO scale. This scale consists of 16 items taken from Pratto et al. (1994) with several of the items were reworded to create a more balanced scale. Sample items include "Some groups of people are just more worthy than others" and "It would be good if all groups could be equal" (reverse-scored). See Appendix E for a complete list of items. The SDO scale demonstrated good reliability in the current sample (coefficient $\alpha = .83$).

Right-wing authoritarianism (RWA). RWA was assessed using a 20 item version of Altemeyer's RWA scale (Altemeyer, 2006). Sample items from this scale include, "The only way our country can get through the crisis ahead is to get back to our traditional values, put some tough leaders in power, and silence the troublemakers spreading bad ideas," and "It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people's minds." See

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

Appendix F for a complete list of items. The RWA scale has consistently demonstrated high internal consistency with coefficient alphas of .87 (Whitley, 1999), .96 (Strube & Rahimi, 2006), and .88 (Duckitt, et al., 2002). Over two decades of studies have also demonstrated the high validity of this scale. The scale also demonstrated good reliability in the current sample (coefficient alpha = .86).

Patriotism. Patriotism was assessed using Schatz et al.'s (1999) Blind and Constructive Patriotism scale. This scale is made up of 12 items measuring blind patriotism and 6 items measuring constructive patriotism. The blind patriotism items measure unquestioning support for the United States and its policies and inability to tolerate criticisms toward the nation. Sample items include, "I would support my country right or wrong" and "It is un-American to criticize this country." The constructive patriotism items express ability to endure criticism of the United States that is based in a positive attachment to the nation and a desire to see positive change. Sample items include, "I oppose some U.S. policies because I care about my country and want to improve it" and "If you care about America, you should notice its problems and work to correct them." See Appendix G for a complete list of items.

Schatz et al. (1999) found coefficient alphas of .79 for the blind patriotism scale and .71 for the constructive patriotism scale. These two scales demonstrated good internal consistency in the current sample as well, with a coefficient alpha of .81 for blind patriotism and a coefficient alpha of .77 for constructive patriotism.

Schatz et al. (1999) also found support for the validity of the measures by demonstrating the orthogonality of the two types of patriotism and the relationship of each type of patriotism to other, similar, variables such as political efficacy, political knowledge, political information

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

gathering, and political activism for constructive patriotism and nationalism, national vulnerability, and cultural contamination for blind patriotism.

Procedure

Participants signed up to participate in the study using an online system and the questionnaire was administered using the university's on-line survey program. Participants were provided a link to the survey when they signed up. Participants began by providing demographic information. They were then presented with the items from the scales described above in random order. They were instructed to answer each question as accurately and honestly as possible. Upon completion of the items, participants submitted their answers and were transferred to a web page that thanked them for their participation and directed to a debriefing statement.

Data Analysis

The data was analyzed using three multiple regression models, each predicting endorsement of stereotypes. Model 1 was a simultaneous multiple regression analysis using blind and constructive patriotism as predictor variables and the stereotyping measure as the outcome variables. This model shows whether there is a relationship between blind patriotism and stereotyping. Model 2 was a hierarchical multiple regression analysis with threat entered at Step 1 and blind and constructive patriotism at Step 2. This model tests whether perceived threat mediates the relationship between blind patriotism and stereotyping. Model 3 is another hierarchical multiple regression with RWA and SDO entered at Step 1, perceived threat at Step 2, and blind and constructive patriotism at Step 3. This model shows whether blind patriotism has a relationship to stereotyping beyond that which could be explained by its relationship with RWA and SDO.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 shows the correlations among the measures used in the study. Consistent with previous research, there was a small but statistically significant negative correlation between blind and constructive patriotism, $r = -.20$, $p < .01$. Blind patriotism had significant positive correlations with RWA, SDO, perceived threat from each of the target groups, and all measures of stereotyping. Constructive patriotism, on the other hand, had only small statistically significant correlations with threat from African Americans and stereotypes of gay men and lesbians; it was uncorrelated with each of the other variables. All of the measures of threat and stereotyping were fairly strongly intercorrelated.

Previous research has demonstrated that participant sex may be an important factor to consider with some of the measures used in the study. For this reason, a series of independent samples *t*-tests were conducted to identify potential sex differences. Table 2 summarizes those results. The results suggest that sex of participant may be important when considering constructive patriotism, SDO, threat and stereotyping of gay men, with males being more likely to endorse each of these constructs than were females.

Negative Stereotypes

To test the value of blind patriotism, constructive patriotism, threat, RWA, and SDO for predicting stereotyping, three separate hierarchical regression analyses were conducted using each of the stereotyping measures as outcome variables as described above. Because of the sex differences found, participant sex was entered in Model 1, thereby accounting for its effects. In Model 2, blind and constructive patriotism were added. In Model 3, the threat measure that

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

corresponded to the stereotyping measure was entered (e.g., for the analysis using negative stereotypes of African Americans, the perceived threat score for African American targets was used). Finally, Model 4 added RWA and SDO. The results of these analyses are summarized in Table 3 and will be described below for each of the three target groups.

African Americans. Model 1 examined the relationship of participant's sex to stereotyping of African Americans. Participant sex was a positive predictor of stereotyping and accounted for about 2% of the variance. The results of Model 2 suggest, as hypothesized, that patriotism is a significant predictor of negative stereotyping of African Americans, accounting for about 14% of the variance, with blind patriotism, but not constructive patriotism, having a significant relationship to stereotyping. However, Model 3 suggests, as hypothesized, that a large part of this relationship was due to the influence of perceived threat. The addition of threat accounted for another 44% of the variance. In addition, constructive patriotism had a significant, albeit small, relationship to stereotyping at the step, suggesting that perceptions of threat might suppress the relation of constructive patriotism to stereotyping. Model 4 added RWA and SDO and indicated that both were also significant predictors of stereotyping, but only accounted for about 3% of the variance. The overall model explained 63% of the variance in stereotyping of African Americans. It is important to note that although blind patriotism was a positive predictor of stereotyping at Model 2, by Model 4 it was no longer significant. This finding suggests that there is a real relationship between blind patriotism and stereotyping, but that the relationship can be entirely explained by overlap of blind patriotism with perceived threat, RWA, and SDO. It is also important to note that in Model 4, while although blind patriotism was not a significant predictor of stereotyping, constructive patriotism was. Even though blind patriotism increased

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

with the addition of threat, RWA, and SDO, constructive patriotism did not. This finding suggests that constructive patriots may stereotype via different mechanisms than blind patriots.

Gay men. The results from the regression analysis using stereotypes of gay men as the outcome variable generally followed the same pattern found with stereotyping of African Americans. In Model 1, the results for participant sex indicated that it was a positive predictor of stereotyping, accounting for 4% of the variance. The inclusion of patriotism resulted in an increase in R^2 of .15, with blind patriotism having a stronger relationship than constructive patriotism. Perceived threat resulted in the largest increase of R^2 , in this case, accounting for about 30% of the variance in stereotyping scores. The addition of RWA and SDO added about 2% to the variance explained. The overall model, while having slightly less predictive power than the Stereotypes of African Americans model, still explained 50% of the variance in stereotyping. In this analysis, blind patriotism remained significant even in Model 4, but it became less important as indicated by a decreasing beta weight. As with stereotypes of African Americans, constructive patriotism remained fairly consistent across the models and was still significant in Model 4.

Lesbians. The results of the analysis using stereotypes of lesbians as the outcome variable also followed the same pattern as the previous two models with the exception that sex was not a significant predictor. In Model 2, , the relationship of patriotism to stereotyping accounted for about 19% of the variance, with blind patriotism having a larger relationship than constructive patriotism. The inclusion of threat added an additional 29% of explained variance, and RWA and SDO increased explained variance by about 4%. Also, blind patriotism once again becomes non-significant in Model 4 while constructive patriotism remained significant. The overall model explains about 52% of the variance in stereotyping of lesbians.

Positive Stereotypes of African Americans

Positive stereotypes of African Americans were analyzed using the same models as the negative stereotypes. These results are also summarized in Table 3. These results follow the same patterns described above, with a few important differences. First, sex is non-significant at in Model 1. Next, patriotism is related to stereotyping, but it accounts for about half as much variance as in the negative stereotyping models, with blind, but not constructive patriotism, being a statistically significant predictor. Perhaps the most important difference is that, while in the negative stereotyping models threat accounted for a large percentage of the variance, threat does not appear to be involved in positive stereotyping. The addition of RWA and SDO to the model functioned in much the same way as it did with the negative stereotyping models. Unlike in the other models, in this case constructive patriotism was not related to stereotyping. Overall, while the models accounted for very large percentages of the variance in negative stereotyping, the predictors accounts for only about 13% of the variance in positive stereotyping.

Discussion

Patriotism is a value that is prized in American culture. However, throughout history people have recognized that patriotism can take both positive and negative forms (Bar-Tal & Staub, 1997). The present study used Schatz's (1994) concepts of blind and constructive patriotism to examine the relationships of positive and negative forms of patriotism to stereotyping of minority groups. I predicted that blind patriotism would be more strongly related to stereotyping than constructive patriotism and that this relationship would be mediated by the perceived threat posed by the target group as well as by RWA and SDO. Although the results generally supported these hypotheses, some unexpected findings also emerged. Among these

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

was the role played by the valence of the stereotypes assessed—whether positive or negative—which appeared to mediate the relationship between patriotism and stereotyping.

Patriotism

Historically, conceptions of patriotism have taken different forms, with researchers usually identifying one form as positive and one negative. Schatz's (1999) model of blind and constructive patriotism is one way to conceptualize these positive and negative forms and the one the present study used. Blind and constructive patriotism have been considered relatively orthogonal constructs with most researchers finding a slight negative correlation (Schatz, et al., 1999; Spry & Hornsey, 2007). The results of the present study echo these results, finding a small negative correlation ($r = -.20, p < .01$). This suggests that blind and constructive patriotism are different facets of patriotism.

Patriotism serves the function of meeting social and psychological needs (Bar-Tal & Staub, 1997). Among those functions is contributing to one's social identity by associating oneself with a large and powerful nation. I theorized that another need patriotism meets is serving as a worldview defense for people who experience chronic feelings of threat. This model is similar to Terror Management Theory (TMT), although TMT deals with acute situational threats while my model addresses the perception of chronic or on-going threat. TMT states that people, when confronted with their own mortality, have a tendency to cling to their worldviews to alleviate the fear generated by their awareness of mortality. Patriotism may also function as defense against perceived threat, with several studies finding positive relationships between perceived threat and blind patriotism (Schatz & Staub, 1997; Spry & Hornsey, 2007). For example, Spry and Hornsey found that blind patriotism was positively correlated with a measure of threat that consisted of four items related to the "watering down" of Australian culture. They

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

also found that constructive patriotism was unrelated to this form of threat. The present study similarly found that blind patriotism was positively correlated with perceived threat from each of three target groups. However, constructive patriotism was not found to be correlated with threat of gay men or lesbians although there was a slight but statistically significant negative correlation between threat of African Americans and constructive patriotism.

RWA and SDO also provided theoretical links between blind patriotism and stereotyping. RWA is an individual difference variable characterized by submission to authority, aggression toward outgroups, and a preference for convention. Previous research has demonstrated that RWA is related to increased stereotyping of minority groups (Strube & Rahimi, 2006; Whitley, 1999). Past studies involving blind patriotism have also suggested that RWA and blind patriotism have a positive relationship (Schatz, et al., 1999; Spry & Hornsey, 2007). Because RWA has been linked to stereotyping and blind patriotism has been linked to RWA, it seemed logical that blind patriotism would be linked to stereotyping as well. Similarly, SDO is an individual difference variable characterized by a preference for maintaining social hierarchies and the status quo. Research has suggested that, like RWA, SDO is related to stereotyping and patriotism (Pena & Sidanius, 2002; Whitley, 1999); however, prior to the current study, no one had systematically studied the relationship between SDO and blind patriotism.

Previous studies involving blind and constructive patriotism have, as did the present study, explored their relationships to RWA, SDO, and threat. Blind patriotism has typically been found to be strongly correlated to RWA (Schatz, et al., 1999; Spry & Hornsey, 2007); the results of the current study supported that finding ($r = .59, p < .001$). Constructive patriotism, on the other hand, has not been found to be related to RWA (Schatz, et al., 1999; Spry & Hornsey,

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

2007); the results of the present study supported this finding as well ($r = -.05$, *ns*). My findings thus lend further support for the relationship of blind, but not constructive, patriotism to RWA.

This study is the first to examine the relationship of blind and constructive patriotism to SDO. The results indicated that blind patriotism ($r = .42$, $p < .001$) is moderately correlated with SDO, but no significant relationship was found for constructive patriotism ($r = -.12$, *ns*).

Negative Stereotypes

Blind patriotism. The results for blind patriotism were consistent with predictions that higher levels of blind patriotism would be related to increased stereotyping. Blind patriotism, at the zero order level, was a fairly strong predictor of stereotyping for all three of the target groups. Blind patriotism had the strongest relationship with stereotyping of lesbians, followed by African Americans, and then gay men. However, as hypothesized, threat, RWA, and SDO mediated these relationships.

Threat. I predicted that threat would mediate the relationship between blind patriotism and stereotyping. Results generally supported this prediction. When threat was entered into the regression model, it resulted in a large percentage increase in the variance in all three of the negative stereotyping measures. Threat played the biggest role in stereotyping of African Americans accounting for 44% of the variance and the smallest role in stereotyping of lesbians in which it still accounted for 29%. Stereotyping of gay men fell in the middle with 30% of the variance. The addition of threat also resulted in a reduction of the beta weight for blind patriotism in each of the three measures. This finding suggests that a portion of the variance in stereotyping accounted for by blind patriotism was, in fact, because of threat. Thus, as predicted, the relationship between blind patriotism and stereotyping is mediated by perceived threat of the minority group being stereotyped.

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

RWA and SDO. After accounting for threat's relationship to stereotyping, adding RWA and SDO to the regression models resulted in a small but significant increase in explained variance. The biggest change was for the stereotyping of lesbians accounting for 4% of the variance followed by African Americans at 3% and gay men at 2%. RWA was statistically significant for each of the three target groups; however SDO was only found to be a significant predictor of stereotyping of African Americans. Adding RWA and SDO to the regression model led to a noticeable decrease in blind patriotism's beta weight, even to the point of becoming non-significant. As with threat, this finding suggests that a portion of the variance in stereotyping that was accounted for by blind patriotism in previous steps of the model was a result of the effects of RWA and SDO. This indicates that RWA and SDO are mediating the relationship of blind patriotism and stereotyping as well.

Because SDO is characterized by support for the social hierarchy, it is possible that differences in where African Americans, gay men, and lesbians fall in the social hierarchy contributed to the non-significant SDO results for gay men and lesbians. African Americans, in the early days of the United States, were considered second class citizens with many, if not most, living as slaves. Slavery created a real, legal social hierarchy with African Americans making up the bottom rung. Slavery was abolished almost 150 years ago, but the effect of being on the bottom of the social hierarchy still exists. Having a substantial number of openly gay men and lesbians in society is relatively new, and thus there is not the historical precedent for where these groups fall on the social hierarchy. Therefore, people who support social hierarchy would be more likely to stereotype African Americans, because they have historically been at the bottom of the social hierarchy, but those same people may be unsure about how gay men and lesbians fit into the social hierarchy.

Conclusion. Much research has been done in the areas of RWA, SDO, and threat. Studies have consistently found these variables to be positively related to stereotyping and prejudice (Whitley & Kite, 2010). Through this research, a comprehensive model has already begun to form. For example, Duckitt's (2006; Whitley & Kite, 2010) model proposes that RWA, mediated by belief in the world as a dangerous place (threat), leads to prejudice and SDO mediated by the world as a competitive place also leads to prejudice. Blind patriotism may fit into this model as a political expression of the joint effects of RWA and SDO. Future research should explore the role of blind patriotism in this model.

Constructive patriotism. Although the results for blind patriotism were as predicted, those for constructive patriotism were somewhat surprising. Constructive patriotism, at the zero order level was, as predicted, less strongly related to stereotyping than blind patriotism, but even so, it still had a positive relationship. Interestingly, although threat, RWA, and SDO were important factors in the blind patriotism-stereotyping relationship, these variables did not appear to alter the constructive patriotism-stereotyping relationship. At each step of the regression model, blind patriotism's beta weights dropped noticeably until at the final step they became non-significant (except for stereotypes of gay men, for which the beta weight dropped from .392, $p < .001$ to .111, $p = .05$). Constructive patriotism's beta weights, on the other hand, fluctuated a little, but generally stayed close to the original beta weight. In fact, while blind patriotism became non-significant, constructive patriotism went from non-significant to significant at the .05 level for African Americans, stayed significant at the .01 level for gay men, and went from significant at the .01 level to significant at the .001 level for lesbians. Therefore, while adding threat, RWA, and SDO accounts for much of blind patriotism's effects, even to the point of making them non-significant, they have little effect on constructive patriotism. This finding

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

suggests that stereotyping by constructive patriots is based on different mechanisms than stereotyping by blind patriots.

One potential explanation for this outcome comes from the results of a series of studies conducted by Devos and Banaji (2005). They found that at the level of implicit attitudes, African Americans are rated as less “American” than Caucasians, even by people who exhibit non-prejudiced explicit attitudes. In regard to patriotism, both blind and constructive patriots exhibit national attachment, although they do so in different ways (Schatz, et al., 1999). National attachment leads one to identify with the nation as an ingroup and, in turn, may lead to ingroup favoritism. If constructive patriots are showing ingroup favoritism toward fellow Americans, they may not have as strongly identified African Americans as part of their ingroup, at least at the implicit level. This distinction could potentially hold true for gay men and lesbians as well.

The finding that constructive patriotism, which is supposed to be the positive form of patriotism, is positively related to negative stereotyping of minority groups is unsettling. Previously, researchers had demonstrated that patriotism can have a sinister side, but that was balanced by the belief that patriotism can have a positive and beneficial side. My results suggest that patriotism, by its very nature, may lead to ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation. Because this study is the first to examine the relationship between constructive patriotism and stereotyping, the results are preliminary and much more research needs to be done on the possible negative effects of constructive patriotism before firm conclusions can be drawn. Future studies need to attempt to replicate this finding, determine the extent to which constructive patriotism may be related to other, potentially more serious negative outcomes, such as prejudice and discrimination, and continue to explore the bases of this relationship.

Positive Stereotypes

While the largest part of this study revolved around negative stereotypes, positive stereotypes of African Americans were also examined to determine the extent to which patriotism's effects generalize across those two forms of stereotyping.

Blind patriotism. Blind patriotism was a positive predictor of positive stereotyping at the zero order level. As with negative stereotyping, RWA and SDO also played a small role in this relationship in that their inclusion accounted for an additional 5% of the variance. However, unlike the case of negative stereotyping, this relationship of blind patriotism to positive stereotypes did not change with the inclusion of threat in the model. These findings indicate that although blind patriotism is related to both positive and negative stereotyping, a different set of mechanisms is involved. That is, although blind patriots engage in positive stereotyping, it is not because they feel threatened.

Taking the results of the positive and negative stereotyping measures together suggests that blind patriotism is related to increased orientation toward stereotyping in general. Based on what we know about blind patriotism, this finding makes sense. Blind patriotism is related to RWA and SDO and both of these variables incorporate support for the status quo. RWA supports the status quo through conventionalism and tradition while SDO does so through support for society's social hierarchy. Buying into stereotypes perpetuates the status quo and slows down the process of improving intergroup relations and bringing about equality. In addition, Sidanius and Pratto (1999) discuss the importance of legitimizing myths in maintaining the social hierarchy, which may also apply to RWA (Whitley, 1999). They define legitimizing myths as "attitudes, values, beliefs, stereotypes, and ideologies that provide moral and intellectual justification for the social practices that distribute social value within the social

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

system” (p.45). In this way, blind patriots can subscribe to positive stereotypes, such as “African Americans are such great dancers” and feel good about themselves while still maintaining the status quo. We hear people extol the praises of African American athletes and musicians, but these myths, although seemingly positive, serve to “keep them in their place” by restricting the social roles in which minority group success is acceptable (Whitley & Kite, 2010).

There is a lot that is left unexplained in this negative patriotism model of positive stereotyping. While the negative stereotyping models account for between 50% and 63% of the variance in stereotyping, the positive stereotyping model only accounts for about 13%. This difference suggests that there is much more involved in this relationship than what has been accounted for in this study. To summarize, blind patriotism leads to stereotyping in general, but perceptions of threat lead to a greater explanation of negative stereotypes than of positive stereotypes.

Constructive Patriotism. The surprising relationship between constructive patriotism and stereotyping becomes even more interesting in light of the fact that while constructive patriotism positively predicted negative stereotyping, it did not predict positive stereotyping. This difference suggests that constructive patriotism is not just an orientation toward increased stereotyping in general, as could be the case with blind patriotism, but rather it is specific to negative stereotypes. If the relationship between constructive patriotism and stereotyping results from ingroup favoritism and a tendency to implicitly see minority groups as less “American,” as was suggested earlier, a similar mechanism could explain positive stereotyping. Subscribing to a negative stereotype about an outgroup sometimes serves the function of ego-defense, that is derogating outgroups makes people feel better about themselves by putting their own group in a more positive light (Whitley & Kite, 2010). However, when subscribing to a positive stereotype

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

about an outgroup, that puts one's ingroup in a more negative light. To illustrate, consider two examples from the Complimentary Stereotype and Negative Prejudices Measure. One negative stereotype item states, "Black people could be as successful as White people if they only worked harder." This item explicitly states that Black people are not successful but that White people are successful. One positive stereotype item states, "Most Black people have a sense of coolness that White people don't have." This item has the opposite tone of the first. It explicitly attributes a positive characteristic to Black people and the lack of that positive attribute to White people. Therefore, most stereotypes imply that if one group is better at something then another group is worse. Thus, positive stereotyping, while it maintains the status quo, may not promote ingroup favoritism.

Sex Differences

Previous research on SDO and attitudes toward homosexuality suggested that it may be important to examine sex differences in the current study and control for them in the regression models. Pratto et al. (1994) found that men had higher levels of SDO than women. The present study also found that men scored significantly higher on SDO than women. In addition, it has consistently been found that men hold more negative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men than do women (Kite & Whitley, 1996, 1998). The present study found that men were both significantly more likely to feel threatened by and significantly more likely to stereotype gay men than were women. This pattern held for lesbian targets as well, but the results were not statistically significant. One rather surprising sex difference the current study found is that men scored significantly higher than women on constructive patriotism. Previous research on blind and constructive patriotism did not report sex differences. Future research should explore these sex differences and their causes.

Theoretical Implications

Because intense patriotism entails a strong focus on and devotion to one's country, the question arises as to whether that devotion could lead to ethnocentrism and perhaps discrimination against citizens of other nations or, as in the present research, minority groups in the United States. This study serves as a first step in investigating the role of patriotism in prejudice and discrimination. Stereotyping is a key component of prejudice and can be a cause of discriminatory behaviors. This study demonstrated an empirical link between blind patriotism and stereotyping of African Americans, gay men, and lesbians. The results of this study also suggest that even constructive patriotism, the proposed positive form of patriotism, is related to stereotyping. These results are somewhat unsettling. They raise the question of what toll this fervent patriotism is taking on some subgroups of Americans and on other nations. How is our obsession with patriotism affecting our intergroup and intragroup relationships? The importance of the role of threat further leads to questions about why Americans feel so threatened and whether those feelings can be assuaged or channeled into less harmful and more useful avenues. It is important to note that this is only a single study and therefore, it would be unwise to draw any definitive conclusions about the inherent positive or negative value of patriotism. Hopefully, this study will generate interest in this topic and lead to future research.

These results also lend support to the role of blind patriotism as a form of worldview defense. The results indicated that people who felt threatened were also more likely to embrace blind patriotism. The results also indicated that threat was the main reason blind patriots engaged in stereotyping. Because the study did not manipulate perceptions of threat as is done in terror management studies, the study's findings suggest that blind patriots feel more chronically threatened by minority groups than do constructive patriots.

Limitations and Future Directions

This study has some inherent limitations. First, the participants were a rather homogenous sample. They were college students, and, as a group, college students differ from the general population in many ways including age, level of education and socioeconomic status (SES). These differences may have had an impact on the results for two reasons. First, these variables have the potential to affect patriotism scores. For example, Coenders and Scheepers (2003) demonstrated that age, education level, social position, and household income all can positively predict two subscales of nationalism (patriotism and chauvinism). Second, these variables have the potential to affect stereotyping scores. Studies have indicated that prejudiced attitudes vary with age and levels of education (Firebaugh & Davis, 1988; Hello, Scheepers, Vermulst, & Gerris, 2004). Because stereotyping is one aspect of prejudice, it is likely that these same patterns exist for stereotyping as well.

Also, because of the target groups used (African Americans, gay men, and lesbians), the sample was composed of only White heterosexuals. While the intent of the study was to examine attitudes of members of this group, it nonetheless gives a rather one dimensional picture of the relationships of blind and constructive patriotism to stereotyping. Future studies would benefit from examining these relationships in more diverse populations to get a better picture of the overall relationships. The population studied might be important, for example, because different ethnic groups may be more or less patriotic (at least as assessed by the scales used in the present study) or their patriotism could manifest itself in different ways. Also, it is possible that stereotyping looks much different depending on what group is doing the stereotyping and what group serves as the target. Shelton (2000) has criticized the fact that psychological research typically assigns ethnic groups the same roles in an experiment time and again: Minority groups

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

are almost always the passive recipients of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination, while majority groups are usually given the active role. As a consequence, not much research has examined the stereotyping done by minority groups.

Finally, all of the stereotyping scales used in the present study were self-report measures. Self-report measures may not always be accurate indicators of socially sensitive attitudes because of participants' attempts at impression management motivated by social desirability concerns. For example, Wittenbrink and Henly (1996) found that participants' racial attitudes were influenced by comparison information about other people's racial attitudes, suggesting that people are concerned with how their attitudes appear to others. The effects of social desirability can be lessened if stereotyping is measured through a disguised behavioral task or by attempting to measure implicit beliefs rather than the more explicit ones used in the current study (Whitley & Kite, 2010). Further, attitudes do not necessarily lead to behavior. A meta-analysis of 60 studies of the relationship of prejudiced attitudes to discriminatory behaviors only found a correlation of about .30 (Schatz & Six, 1996). This finding indicates that although there is a relationship between prejudice and discrimination, it is not large. A possible future study could examine whether there is a relationship between patriotism and behavioral measures of discrimination, such as choosing among job applicants from various groups.

Conclusions

Patriotism is an extremely prevalent and important part of American culture. The results of this study suggest that certain types of patriotism can lead to stereotyping. This is important because while stereotyping is a normal cognitive process that helps us categorize information, it has the potential to lead to prejudiced attitudes and discriminatory behaviors. Patriotism is most often seen as a positive force, but if some forms of patriotism, or worse, all forms of patriotism,

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

lead to discrimination of fellow Americans, such as African Americans, gay men, and lesbians, then this is quite problematic. Discriminating against groups in the name of patriotism directly contradicts the unity, love, and cooperative spirit that patriotism should be fostering.

References

- Aberson, C. L., Healy, M., & Romero, V. (2000). Ingroup bias and self-esteem: A meta-analysis. *Personality & Social Psychology Review, 4*, 157-173.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Canada: The University of Manitoba Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (2006). The authoritarians Available from <http://members.shaw.ca/jeanaltemeyer/drbob/TheAuthoritarians.pdf>
- Bar-Tal, D. (1997). The monopolization of patriotism. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism: In the lives of individuals and nations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Staub, E. (1997). Introduction: Patriotism: Its scope and meaning. In D. Bar-Tal, & Staub, E. & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism: In the lives of individuals and nations* (pp. 45-90). Chicago: Nelson Hall.
- Coenders, M., & Scheepers, P. (2003). The effect of education on nationalism and ethnic exclusionism: An international comparison. *Political Psychology, 24*(2), 313-343.
- Crowson, H. M. (2009). Predicting perceptions of symbolic and realistic threat From terrorists: The role of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation. *Individual Differences Research, 7*, 113-118.
- Czopp, A. M., & Monteith, M. J. (2006). Thinking well of African Americans: Measuring complimentary stereotypes and negative prejudice. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 28*, 233-250.
- Devos, T., & Banaji, M., R. (2005). American = white? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 447-466.

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

Duckitt, J. (2001). A dual-process cognitive-motivational theory of ideology and prejudice.

Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 33, 41-113.

Duckitt, J. (2006). Differential effects of right wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation on outgroup attitudes and their mediation by threat from and competitiveness to outgroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 684-696.

Duckitt, J., Wagner, C., du Plessi, I., & Birum, I. (2002). The psychological bases of ideology and prejudice: Testing a dual process model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 75-93.

Firebaugh, G., & Davis, K. E. (1988). Trends in Antiblack Prejudice, 1972-1984: Region and Cohort Effects. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94(2), 251-272.

Gozman, L. (1997). Russian patriotism: Forward to the past. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism: In the lives of individuals and nations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Hello, E., Scheepers, P., Vermulst, A., & Gerris, J. R. M. (2004). Association between Educational Attainment and Ethnic Distance in Young Adults: Socialization by Schools or Parents? *Acta Sociologica*, 47(3), 253-275.

Johnson, G. R. (1997). The evolutionary roots of patriotism. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism: In the lives of individuals and nations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Jost, J. T., & Thompson, E. P. (2000). Group-based dominance and opposition to equality as independent predictors of self-esteem, ethnocentrism, and social policy attitudes among African Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 36, 209-232.

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

- Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1996). Sex differences in attitudes toward homosexual persons, behaviors, and civil rights: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(4), 336-353.
- Kite, M. E., & Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1998). Do heterosexual women and men differ in their attitudes toward homosexuality? A conceptual and methodological analysis. In G. M. Herek (Ed.), *Stigma and sexual orientation: Understanding prejudice against lesbians, gay men, and bisexuals*. (pp. 39-61). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lamar, L. A., & Kite, M. E. (1998). Sex differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: A multi-dimensional perspective. *The Journal of Sex Research* 35, 189-196.
- Morrison, K. R., Fast, N. J., & Ybarra, O. (2009). Group status, perceptions of threat, and support for social inequality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45(1), 204-210.
- Pena, Y., & Sidanius, J. (2002). U.S. patriotism and ideologies of group dominance: A tale of asymmetry. [Article]. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 142, 782-790.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763.
- Reykowski, J. (1997). Patriotism and the collective system of meanings In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism: In the lives of individuals and nations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Schaller, M., & Maass, A. (1989). Illusory correlation and social categorization: Toward an integration of motivational and cognitive factors in stereotype formation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 709-721.

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

- Schatz, H., & Six, B. (1996). How strong is the relationship between prejudice and discrimination? A meta-analytic answer. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 20(3-4), 441-462.
- Schatz, R. T. (1994). *On being a good American: Blind versus constructive patriotism*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Schatz, R. T., & Staub, E. (1997). Manifestations of blind and constructive patriotism: Personality correlates and individual-group relations. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism: In the lives of individuals and nations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- Schatz, R. T., Staub, E., & Lavine, H. (1999). On the varieties of national attachment: Blind versus constructive patriotism. *Political Psychology*, 20, 151-174.
- Shelton, J. N. (2000). A reconceptualization of how we study issues of racial prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 374-390.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., & Pyszczynski, T. (2000). Pride and prejudice: Fear of death and social behavior. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 9, 200-204.
- Spry, C., & Hornsey, M. (2007). The influence of blind and constructive patriotism on attitudes toward multiculturalism and immigration. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 59, 151-158.
- Staub, E. (1997). Blind versus constructive patriotism: Moving from embeddedness in the group to critical loyalty and action. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism: In the lives of individuals and nations*. Chicago: Nelson Hall.

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

- Strube, M. J., & Rahimi, A. M. (2006). "Everybody knows it's true": Social dominance orientation and right-wing authoritarianism moderate false consensus for stereotypic beliefs. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(6), 1038-1053.
- Tajfel, H., Billig, M., Bundy, R., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 1, 149-178.
- Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1999). Right-wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation, and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(1), 126-134.
- Whitley, B. E. J., & Kite, M. E. (2010). *The psychology of prejudice and discrimination* (2nd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Wittenbrink, B., & Henly, J. R. (1996). Creating social reality: Informational social influence and the content of stereotypic beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(6), 598-610.
- Worchel, S., & Coutant, D. (1997). The tangled web of loyalty: Nationalism, patriotism, and ethnocentrism. In D. Bar-Tal & E. Staub (Eds.), *Patriotism: In the lives of individuals and nations*. Chicago: Nelson Hall.

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

Appendix A

Demographic Items

1. Sex:

A. Male

B. Female

2. Age: _____

3. Race:

A. Caucasian/White

B. African American/Black

C. American Indian or Alaskan Native

D. Asian or Pacific Islander

E. Latino, Latina/Hispanic

F. Other

9. Nationality (Choose the one which best describes you):

A. Born in the United States

B. Naturalized U.S. Citizen

C. U.S. Permanent Resident

D. Citizen of a different nation

10. Sexuality (Choose which category best describes you):

A. Completely Homosexual

B. Mostly Homosexual

C. Bisexual

D. Mostly Heterosexual

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

E. Completely Heterosexual

Appendix B

The Multidimensional Racial Attitudes (CSNP) Scale

N(Inf) 1. There are so many Black criminals because Black people are naturally more aggressive.

P(Ath) 2. Black people do not have a natural “instinct” for athletics.*

N(Pol) 3. Housing laws should be passed that encourage greater racial integration of neighborhoods.*

P(Ath) 4. A Black person is wasting an opportunity by not getting involved in athletics.

P(Sex) 5. I think the way Black people talk and the expressions they use are cool.

P(Ath) 6. The success of Black athletes has nothing to do with their natural ability.*

P(Mus) 7. Black people often have a difficult time picking up the beat to music.*

P(Sex) 8. Black people have a unique quality of sexuality that most White people don’t have.

N(Inf) 9. There will always be racial differences in intelligence.

N(Con) 10. I think it would be fun to have a Black roommate.*

P(Ath) 11. There are so many Black athletes in professional sports because of their innate ability.

N(Inf) 12. Black people should learn to work hard rather than look for “freebies” and “handouts.”

P(Sex) 13. Black people usually aren’t very stylish in their appearance.*

P(Mus) 14. A natural sense of rhythm makes rapping easy for Black people.

N(Pol) 15. Affirmative Action is not just reverse discrimination against White people.*

N(Inf) 16. As a whole, White people aren’t smarter than Black people.*

N(Pol) 17. The welfare system really just allows Black people to “mooch” money from the government.

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

N(Con) 18. It's just not natural to see a Black person and a White person holding hands and kissing.

P(Ath) 19. It's true that White men really can't jump as well as Black men.

N(Inf) 20. Black people could be as successful as White people if they only worked harder.

P(Sex) 21. Most Black people have a sense of coolness that White people don't have.

N(Pol) 22. White people lose a lot of jobs to Black people because of racial quotas in hiring processes.

P(Sex) 23. Black men and women give off an aura of sensuality.

N(Con) 24. I can't understand why a White person would want to date a Black person.

P(Mus) 25. When music starts playing, I expect Black people to start moving to the beat.

P(Mus) 26. White choirs put on a much better performance than Black choirs.*

N(Con) 27. I would have no problems with dating a Black person.*

P(Mus) 28. Black people should take advantage of their natural abilities to sing and dance.

N(Pol) 29. The government is already spending too much time catering to the wishes of Black people.

N(Con) 30. I enjoy groups that are racially diverse.*

Note. N = Negative Attitudes, P = Positive Attitudes, (Inf) = Inferiority, (Pol) = Policy, (Con) = Contact, (Ath) = Athleticism, (Mus) = Musical/Rhythmic, (Sex) = Cool/Sexual. * Indicates the item is to be reverse scored

Appendix C

Lamar and Kite's (1998) Components of Attitudes toward Homosexuality

Gay Male/Lesbian Stereotypes

Alpha = .78 for gay male target and .75 for lesbian target

1. Lesbians (gay men) prefer to take roles (passive or aggressive) in their sexual behavior.
2. The love between two lesbians (gay men) is quite different from the love between two persons of the opposite sex.
3. Lesbians (gay men) have weaker sex drives than heterosexuals.
4. A lesbian's (gay man's) mother is probably very domineering.
5. Most lesbians (gay men) have a life of one night stands.
6. Most lesbians (gay men) like to dress in opposite-sex clothing.
7. Most lesbians (gay men) have identifiable masculine (feminine) characteristics.

Note: * Indicates item is to be reverse scored

Appendix D

Duckitt's (2006) Intergroup Threat Scale

1. African Americans (lesbians, gay men) seem to reject moral values that are important to me.
2. African Americans (lesbians, gay men) strengthen values, norms, and traditions that are important to people like me.*
3. African Americans (lesbians, gay men) are a danger to everything I feel is good, normal, moral, and decent in society.
4. I am afraid that African Americans (lesbians, gay men) make our society more dangerous for ordinary people.
5. African Americans (lesbians, gay men) seem to want to destroy or harm what is good in our society.
6. African Americans (lesbians, gay men) help to make our society stronger and more united.*
7. African Americans (lesbians, gay men) do NOT threaten to harm us or society in any way at all.*
8. African Americans (lesbians, gay men) help to make our society safer and less dangerous.*

Note. * Indicates that the item is to be reverse scored

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

Jost and Thompson's (2000) "Balanced" Social Dominance Orientation Scale

1. Group equality is not a worthwhile ideal.
2. To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups.
3. No group of people is more worthy than any other. *
4. It would be good if all groups could be equal. *
5. In getting what your own group wants, it should never be necessary to use force against other groups. *
6. Increased social equality would be a bad thing.
7. All groups should be given an equal chance in life.*
8. If certain groups of people stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems.
9. We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups.*
10. Superior groups should not seek to dominate inferior groups.*
11. Inferior groups should stay in their place.
12. Treating different groups more equally would create more problems than it would solve.*
13. There is no point in trying to make incomes more equal.
14. It's a real problem that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom. *
15. No one group should dominate in society. *
16. Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place.

Note: * Indicates that the item is to be reverse scored

Appendix F

Right-Wing Authoritarianism Scale

1. The established authorities generally turn out to be right about things, while the radicals and protestors are usually just “loud mouths” showing off their ignorance.
2. Women should have to promise to obey their husbands when they get married.
3. Our country desperately needs a mighty leader who will do what has to be done to destroy the radical new ways and sinfulness that are ruining us.
4. Gays and lesbians are just as healthy and moral as anybody else.*
5. It is always better to trust the judgment of the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people’s minds.
6. Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly. *
7. The only way our country can get through the crisis ahead is to get back to our traditional values, put some tough leaders in power, and silence the troublemakers spreading bad ideas.
8. There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps. *
9. Our country needs free thinkers who have the courage to defy traditional ways, even if this upsets many people. *
10. Our country will be destroyed someday if we do not smash the perversions eating away at our moral fiber and traditional beliefs.
11. Everyone should have their own lifestyle, religious beliefs, and sexual preferences, even if it makes them different from everyone else.*
12. The “old-fashioned ways” and the “old-fashioned values” still show the best way to live.

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

13. You have to admire those who challenged the law and the majority's view by protesting for women's abortion rights, for animal rights, or to abolish school prayer. *
14. What our country really needs is a strong, determined leader who will crush evil, and take us back to our true path.
15. Some of the best people in our country are those who are challenging our government, criticizing religion, and ignoring the "normal way things are supposed to be done." *
16. God's laws about abortion, pornography and marriage must be strictly followed before it is too late, and those who break them must be strongly punished.
17. There are many radical, immoral people in our country today, who are trying to ruin it for their own godless purposes, whom the authorities should put out of action.
18. A "woman's place" should be wherever she wants to be. The days when women are submissive to their husbands and social conventions belong strictly in the past. *
19. Our country will be great if we honor the ways of our forefathers, do what the authorities tell us to do, and get rid of the "rotten apples" who are ruining everything.
20. There is no "ONE right way" to live life; everybody has to create their own way. *
21. Feminists should be praised for being brave enough to defy "traditional family values." *
22. This country would work a lot better if certain groups of troublemakers would just shut up and accept their group's traditional place in society.

Note. * Indicates that the item is to be reverse scored

Appendix G

Schatz et al.'s (1999) Blind and Constructive Patriotism Scale

Blind Patriotism Items

1. People who do not wholeheartedly support America should live somewhere else.
2. The United States is virtually always right.
3. I would support my country right or wrong.
4. The anti-Vietnam war protesters were un-American.
5. For the most part, people who protest and demonstrate against U.S. policy are good, upstanding, intelligent people. *
6. I believe that U.S. policies are almost always the morally correct ones.
7. If another country disagreed with an important United States policy that I knew little about, I would *not* necessarily support my country's position. *
8. People should not constantly try to change the way things are in America.
9. I support U.S. policies for the very reason that they are the policies of my country.
10. There is too much criticism of the U.S. in the world, and we its citizens should not criticize it.
11. It is un-American to criticize this country.
12. We should have complete freedom of speech even for those who criticize the country. *

Constructive Patriotism Items

14. People should work hard to move this country in a positive direction.
15. If you love America, you should notice its problems and work to correct them.
16. If I criticize the United States, I do so out of love for my country.
17. I oppose some U.S. policies because I care about my country and want to improve it.
18. I express my love for America by supporting efforts at positive change.

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

19. My love of country demands that I speak out against popular but potentially destructive policies.

Note. * Indicates the item is to be reverse scored

Table 1

Intercorrelations Among Variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Blind Patriotism	---										
2. Constructive Patriotism	-.20**	---									
3. RWA	.59***	-.05	---								
4. SDO	.42***	-.12	.44***	---							
5. ITS African Americans	.32***	-.16*	.34***	.65***	---						
6. ITS Gay Men	.28***	.09	.69***	.40***	.36***	---					
7. ITS Lesbians	.32***	.08	.70***	.36***	.30***	.88***	---				
8. CSNP Negative	.35***	.06	.42***	.61***	.73***	.44***	.37***	---			
9. CSNP Positive	.28***	-.01	.27***	.28***	.13*	.24***	.28***	.18**	---		
10. CATH Gay Men	.35***	.17*	.59***	.40***	.36***	.68***	.68***	.44***	.35***	---	
11. CATH Lesbians	.38***	.15*	.63***	.38***	.34***	.63***	.67***	.46***	.35***	.84***	---

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

Note: RWA = Right Wing Authoritarianism, SDO = Social Dominance Orientation, ITS = Intergroup Treat Scale, CSNP = Complimentary Stereotypes and Negative Prejudice, CATH = Components of Attitudes Toward Homosexuality

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

Table 2

Mean Scores on Variables by Sex of Participant

Variables	Male	Female	<i>t</i> (242)
Blind Patriotism	29.52 (7.35)	30.66 (5.41)	-1.34 _a
Constructive Patriotism	22.93 (3.41)	21.70 (3.04)	2.96**
RWA	55.07 (11.05)	55.34 (11.11)	-0.19
SDO	39.44 (7.97)	36.55 (7.16)	2.96**
ITS African Americans	19.45 (4.79)	19.06 (4.25)	0.67
ITS Gay Men	23.01 (6.80)	20.39 (4.80)	3.34 _b **
ITS Lesbians	22.48 (5.81)	21.15 (4.98)	1.86 _b
CSNP Negative	37.94 (6.65)	36.35 (6.62)	1.85
CSNP Positive	38.30 (5.61)	38.60 (4.61)	-0.40 _c
CATH Gay Men	19.29 (4.23)	17.76 (3.99)	2.87**
CATH Lesbians	18.42 (3.93)	17.63 (4.37)	1.44

Note. Higher numbers indicated higher levels of the trait

Values in parentheses represent standard deviations.

_a Equality of variances not assumed, $df = 173.33$; _b equality of variances not assumed, $df = 168.21$; _c equality of variances not assumed, $df = 193.95$; _d equality of variances not assumed, $df = 188.23$

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

Note: RWA = Right Wing Authoritarianism, SDO = Social Dominance Orientation, ITS = Intergroup Treat Scale, CSNP = Complimentary Stereotypes and Negative Prejudice, CATH = Components of Attitudes Toward Homosexuality

Table 3

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Stereotyping

Model	Predictor	CSNP Negative		CSNP Positive		CATH Gay Men		CATH Lesbians	
		Beta	Model	Beta	Model	Beta	Model	Beta	Model
			ΔR^2		ΔR^2		ΔR^2		ΔR^2
1	Sex	-0.14*	0.02*	0.02	0.00	-0.19**	0.04**	-.011	0.01
2	Sex	-0.15*	0.14***	-0.01	0.08***	-0.19**	0.15***	-0.10	0.19***
	Blind Patriotism	0.39***		0.29***		0.38***		0.42***	.
	Constructive Patriotism	0.10		0.02		0.15**		0.20**	
3	Sex	-0.07	0.44***	0.00	0.00	-0.04	0.30***	-0.03	0.29***
	Threat	0.71***		0.02		0.59***		0.58***	
	Blind Patriotism	0.16***		0.28***		0.21***		0.22***	
	Constructive Patriotism	0.19***		0.02		0.12**		0.14**	
4	Sex	-0.04	0.03***	0.04	0.05**	-0.05	0.02**	-0.02	0.04***

BLIND PATRIOTISM, STEREOTYPING, AND THREAT

RWA	0.15**	0.16*	0.19**	0.27***
SDO	0.14*	0.21*	0.07	0.08
Threat	0.61***	-0.13	0.46***	0.41***
Blind Patriotism	0.04	0.15*	0.11*	0.09
Constructive Patriotism	0.18***	0.03	0.13**	0.16***
	Final R ² = 0.63	Final R ² = 0.13	Final R ² = 0.50	Final R ² = 0.52

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$

Note: RWA = Right Wing Authoritarianism, SDO = Social Dominance Orientation, ITS = Intergroup Treat Scale, CSNP = Complimentary Stereotypes and Negative Prejudice, CATH = Components of Attitudes Toward Homosexuality

Participant Sex was dummy coded with 0 representing Male and 1 Representing Female.